



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/536,553

02/10/2006

Wilhelmus Petrus Van Deijzen

3135-051655

7094

28289 7590 01/19/2011  
THE WEBB LAW FIRM, P.C.  
700 KOPPERS BUILDING  
436 SEVENTH AVENUE  
PITTSBURGH, PA 15219

EXAMINER

ANYIKIRE, CHIKAODILI E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2482

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/19/2011

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/536,553	<b>Applicant(s)</b> VAN DEIJZEN, WILHELMUS PETRUS	
	<b>Examiner</b> CHIKAODILI E. ANYIKIRE	<b>Art Unit</b> 2482	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 November 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 16-18,20-22,25 and 27-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 16-18,20-22,25 and 27-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 February 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This application is responsive to application number (10536553) filed on February 10, 2006. Claims 16-18 and 20-30 are pending and have been examined.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. Claims 16-18 and 25-27 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ely (WO 97/40624) in view of Williams et al (US 2004/0101166, hereafter Williams) in further view of Trajkovic et al (US 6,632,232, hereafter Trajkovic).

As per **claim 16**, Ely discloses a system for processing visual information, comprising:

a plurality of cameras for recording visual information (Fig 2 elements 114; page 10 lines 3 – 15),

a control room (Fig 2 element 104) in communication with the cameras and having means for displaying recorded visual information; control means for influencing the means for displaying the recorded visual information in the control room (page 9 lines 4-15 and page 14 lines 10-18), and

storage means for storing operations performed with the control means (page 12 lines 18-30 and page 14 lines 20 – 30; page 12 teaches the ability to store the compressed data from the encoding operations) to influence the means for displaying the recorded visual information.

However, Ely does not explicitly teach input means for supplying to the storage means an identification of an operator of the control means.

In the same field of endeavor, Williams teaches input means for supplying to the storage means an identification of an operator of the control means (paragraph [0048]).

However, Ely or Williams do not teach detection means configured to observe behavior of the system, wherein the detection is connected to the storage means for storing the operations performed with the control means, wherein the storage means are configured to store the information generated with the detection means.

In the same field of endeavor, Trajkovic discloses detection means configured to observe behavior of the system, wherein the detection is connected to the storage

Art Unit: 2482

means for storing the operations performed with the control means, wherein the storage means are configured to store the information generated with the detection means (column 7 lines 25 – 40; Trajkovic uses history information from the user such as assessing the internet which is detection of the behavior of the debt).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of Ely with the invention of Williams in further view of Trajkovic. The advantage is the system being able to recognize the user of the system at any given time and with Trajkovic computing a least cost and optimal path during surveillance.

As per **claim 17**, Ely discloses the system as claimed in claim 16, wherein the storage means are adapted to store the operations performed with the control means in combination with at least a part of the visual information displayed as a result of the operations performed with the control means (page 12 lines 18-30; teaches the ability to store the compressed data from the encoding operations).

As per **claim 18**, Ely discloses the system as claimed in claim 16, wherein the control room is also provided with communication means and the storage means are adapted to store the operations performed with the communication means (page 9 lines 10 – 18; teaches that the control room (i.e. host computer located in the central room) communications with a communications means (i.e. LAN)).

Regarding **claim 25**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 16 are applicable for claim 25.

Regarding **claim 26**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 17 are applicable for claim 26.

Regarding **claim 27**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 18 are applicable for claim 27.

5. Claims 20 - 24 and 28 - 30 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ely (WO 97/40624) in view of Williams et al (US 2004/0101166, hereafter Williams) in further view of Trajkovic et al (US 6,633,232) (hereafter Ely) in further view of Eshelman (US 6,611,206).

As per **claim 20**, Ely teaches the system as claimed in claim 16.

However, Ely does not explicitly teach wherein the system is also provided with a data processing unit with which statistical information is generated from the operations performed with the control means.

In the same field of endeavor, Eshelman teaches wherein the system is also provided with a data processing unit with which statistical information is generated from the operations performed with the control means (column 6 lines 1 – 11 and column 11 lines 26-30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify invention of Ely in view of Eshelman. The advantage is combination of data in ways that allow useful patterns to be detected in the manner that a human observer can detect subtle patterns.

As per **claim 21**, Ely teaches the system as claimed in claim 20.

However, Ely does not explicitly teach wherein the system is also provided with second storage means adapted to store the statistical information generated by means of the data processing unit.

In the same field of endeavor, Eshelman teaches wherein the system is also provided with second storage means adapted to store the statistical information generated by means of the data processing unit (column 6 lines 1 – 11 and column 11 lines 26-30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify invention of Ely in view of Eshelman. The advantage is combination of data in ways that allow useful patterns to be detected in the manner that a human observer can detect subtle patterns.

As per **claim 22**, Ely teaches the system as claimed in claim 20.

However, Ely does not explicitly teach wherein the data processing unit connects to a control module with which the information displayed in the control room is transmitted.

In the same field of endeavor, Eshelman teaches wherein the data processing unit connects to a control module with which the information displayed in the control room is transmitted (column 5 lines 47-50, column 6 lines 1 – 11 and column 11 lines

Art Unit: 2482

26-30; Eshelman teaches that a unit is used to generate statistical information that can be sent to a central location).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify invention of Ely in view of Eshelman. The advantage is combination of data in ways that allow useful patterns to be detected in the manner that a human observer can detect subtle patterns.

Regarding **claim 28**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 19 are applicable for claim 28.

Regarding **claim 29**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 20 are applicable for claim 29.

Regarding **claim 30**, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 21 are applicable for claim 30.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHIKAODILI E. ANYIKIRE whose telephone number is (571)270-1445. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday, 7:30 am to 5 pm, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha D. Banks-Harold can be reached on (571) 272 - 7905. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2482

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Marsha D. Banks-Harold/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2482

/Chikaodili E Anyikire/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2482